Date/Time of Incident	Date of Review	'		Revie	wer	Investigator	Facility
Yes = Informatio No = Informatio NA = Standard i LR = Late repor The Comments section may	ne evaluated as follows in present meets the s in is not present OR in is not relevant for the ting – Late Reporting be used to clarify inf in please see the Face	with specification with specific	pecific rd ation is red ion, bu	evalues s prese	ation in ent but not be	each Standard's Comment does not meet the Stan used as a stand-alone re	
Standard for Ir	ntroduction	Yes	No	NA	LR	Co	omments
1. Facility submitted a Investigation to DM a. Hospitals: withir of the incident; b. Nursing and ICF working days of	MHDDAS: n 14 calendar days /MR: within 5 the incident.						
2. Staff made an imme	•						
the Facility Directo representative.	r or designated						
	designated gned an two hours of						
representative. 3. Facility Director or representative assignivestigator within	designated gned an two hours of the incident. inimmediate initial						

Individual Name:

contact.

Facility made an immediate initial report to DMHDDAS by email.

	Standard for Immediate Protections	Yes	No	NA	Comments
1.	Immediately, staff discovering an				
	incident provided first aid within				
	their ability related to their training,				
	and if applicable, requested additional				
	medical assistance. (page 9)				

Investigation #:

	Standard for Immediate Protections	Yes	No	NA	Comments
2.					
	from direct care.				
3.	Interventions were put in place to				
J .	ensure the safety of all individuals,				
	staff, and other persons.				
	F				
4.	The scene was not disturbed and				
4.	persons were prohibited from				
	removing or destroying actual or				
	potential evidence.				
5.	Potential witnesses were kept at the				
J .	scene and kept separated.				
	Seems and Nepr Separates.				
6.	Relevant documentary evidence was				
	secured.				
7.	Relevant physical evidence was				
	secured.				
9	standard for Investigative Procedure	Yes	No	NA	Comments
1.	Investigation was initiated within 2				
	hours of assignment.				
	J				
2.	Relevant physical evidence was				
	collected and logged.				
3.	Photographs were taken of all visible				
	injuries or to document that no injury				
	was present.				
4.	Relevant demonstrative evidence was				
	collected and logged.				
	Standard for Testimonial Evidence	Yes	No	NA	Comments
1.		162	1/10	IVA	Comments
1.	Interview order is reporter, victims, witnesses, and aggressors/targets,				
	OR the report CLEARLY states the				
	reason for not doing so.				
	control nor doing so.				
2.	Interviews were conducted with and				
	1		1	i .	l e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e

	Standard for Testimonial Evidence	Yes	No	NA	Comments
	written statements obtained from				
	the reporter identified, including				
	those whose ability to communicate is				
	impaired, using a client advocate,				
	interpreter, familiar staff of the				
	individual to assist with the individual,				
	or familiar staff of the individual to				
	provide information to assist with the				
	questions and statement write-up OR				
	the report CLEARLY states the				
	reason for not doing so.				
3.	Interviews were conducted with and				
	statements obtained from victims				
	identified, including those whose				
	ability to communicate is impaired,				
	using a client advocate, interpreter,				
	familiar staff of the individual to				
	assist with the individual, or familiar				
	staff of the individual to provide				
	information to assist with the				
	,,				
	questions and statement write-up OR				
	the report CLEARLY states the				
1	reason for not doing so.				
4.	Interviews were conducted with and				
	written statements obtained from				
	relevant witnesses including other				
	individuals identified OR the report				
	CLEARLY states the reason for not				
5.	doing so. Interviews were conducted with and				
9.					
	statements obtained from aggressors				
	(individuals) and/or target staff				
	identified, including those whose				
	ability to communicate is impaired,				
	using a client advocate, interpreter,				
	familiar staff of the individual to				
	assist with the individual, or familiar				
	staff of the individual to provide				
	information to assist with the				
	questions and statement write-up OR				
	the report CLEARLY states the				
	reason for not doing so.				
6.	Interviews were conducted with and				
	written statements obtained from				
	staff who provided initial first				
	aid/treatment OR the report				
	CLEARLY states the reason for not				
	doing so.				
7.	Interviews began within 24 hours of				DMIJDDAS Europadad Toyantination Daview Effective 0/1/09 Dags 2 of 6

	Standard for Testimonial Evidence	Yes	No	NA	Comments
	the incident or discovery time OR the				
	report CLEARLY states the reason				
	for not doing so.				
8.	Follow-up interviews were conducted				
0.	•				
	if conflicting testimony was gathered				
	during the investigation.				
9.	Relevant documentary evidence,				
7.	excluding written statements, was				
	collected and secured.				
	collected and secured.				
		,			
St	andard for Summary of the Evidence	Yes	No	NA	Comments
1.	Initial investigatory question is	, 03	. 45	, 4,74	Confinionia
1.	· · ·				
	framed in such a way it helped guide				
	the investigation to determine how				
	the incident occurred and/or how				
	the injury occurred.				
2.	Secondary investigatory question is				
	framed in such a way it helped guide				
	the investigation to determine				
	whether abuse, neglect,				
	exploitation, mistreatment, or other				
	harm has been found to be				
	substantiated, unsubstantiated, or				
	inconclusive.				
2					
3.	Sufficient evidence is presented and				
	analyzed to confirm the cause of the				
	incident.				
4	Cufficient establishment in the second of the				
4.	Sufficient evidence is presented and				
	analyzed to confirm the cause of the				
	injury.				
	Standard for Analysis and Findings	Yes	No	NA	Comments
1.	Initial investigatory question				
	conclusion is based on a				
	preponderance of the evidence it is				
	• •				
	more likely than not a particular set				
	of facts is true and includes an				
	analysis that supports the conclusion.				
2.	Secondary investigatory question				
	_ , .				

St	tandard for Summary of the Evidence	Yes	No	NA	Comments
	conclusion is based on a preponderance of the evidence it is more likely than not a particular set of facts is true and includes an analysis that supports the conclusion.				
3.	Tertiary investigatory question conclusion is based on a preponderance of the evidence it is more likely than not a particular set of facts is true and includes an analysis that supports the conclusion.				
4.	Quaternary investigatory question conclusion is based on a preponderance of the evidence it is more likely than not a particular set of facts is true and includes an analysis that supports the conclusion.				

DMHDDAS Expanded Investigation Review - Interview Worksheet

Name of Reporter, Victims, Witnesses, Aggressors/Targets	Person Interviewed YES	Person Interviewed NO	Statement Taken YES	Statement Taken NO	Comments

Instructions: The source of the information for this worksheet is the <u>Final Expanded Investigation</u>. In compiling the list of reporters, victims, witnesses, and aggressors/targets, as applicable, the reviewer should read the entire investigative report first, including any attachments. At each point where the reviewer identifies someone who might have relevant testimonial evidence, the reviewer should write the person's name on this worksheet.

After compiling this list, compare it with those witnesses and potential witnesses the investigator actually interviewed and from whom a statement was obtained.

Responses should be marked as follows:

Person Interviewed, YES Person Interviewed, NO	Compared to the report, the witness or potential witness was interviewed Compared to the report, the witness or potential witness was not interviewed, but should have been interviewed
Statement Taken, YES	Compared to the report, the witness or potential witness gave a written statement
Statement Taken, NO	Compared to the report, the witness or potential witness did not give a written statement,
	but should have given a written statement

If the reviewer writes down a name of a witness or potential witness and makes a determination after reviewing the report that neither an interview nor statement was needed, mark one solid line through the name and comment appropriately in the Comments section.

Individual Name: Record Individual's name Investigation #: Record Investigation number

DMHDDAS Expanded Investigation Review

Date/Time of Incident	Date of Review	Reviewer	Investigator / Team Leader	Facility
Record the date and time of the incident	Record the date of the Review	Record the Reviewer's name	Record the investigator's name	Record the name of the facility

Instructions: <u>All</u> information to complete the Expanded Investigation Review is obtained from the <u>Final Expanded Investigation</u> <u>Report.</u> Standards should be evaluated as follows with specific evaluation in each Standard's Comments section:

Yes = Information present meets the standard

No = Information is not present OR information is present but does not meet the Standard

NA = Standard is not relevant for the case

LR = Late reporting - Late Reporting occurred

The Comments section may be used to clarify information, but may not be used as a stand-alone response. For further information related to the Standards, please see the Facility Risk Management Protocol (FRMP) Effective September 1, 2008, and the Investigations Manual, 6th Edition.

	Standard for Introduction	Yes	No	NA	LR	Comments
1.	Facility submitted a final Expanded Investigation to DMHDDAS: a. Hospitals: within 14 calendar days of the incident; b. Nursing and ICF/MR: within 5 working days of the incident.					Compare Expanded Investigation Date of Final Report to Date of Incident. Do not count the day of the incident, and move forward the correct number of calendar days to get the total count. Yes: Submission occurred within timeframe No: Submission occurred after timeframe
2.	Staff made an immediate report to the Facility Director or designated representative.					See Expanded Investigation I.G. Yes: Notification to Facility Director was 15 minutes or less compared to <u>time of incident</u> , given a small timeframe for first aid and immediate protections No: Notification to Facility Director was 16 minutes or greater compared to <u>time of incident</u> LR: Late reporting occurred
3.	Facility Director or designated representative assigned an investigator within two hours of receiving notice of the incident.					See Expanded Investigation I.H. Yes: Investigator assigned within 2 hours of time reported in #2 above No: Investigator assigned after 2 hours of time reported in #2 above
4.	The facility made an immediate initial report to DCBS through a telephone call.					See Expanded Investigation I.I. Yes: Report was 30 minutes or less compared to time of incident or time of discovery, given a small timeframe for first aid and immediate protections No: Report was 31 minutes or greater compared to time of incident or time of discovery
5.	Facility notified promptly parents, guardians, next of kin, or emergency contact.					See Expanded Investigation I.M. Yes: Parent, guardians, next of kin or emergency contact were reached within 12 hours of time of incident or time of discovery, OR a written notice was sent if the 12 hour timeframe is not met

	Standard for Introduction	Yes	No	NA	LR	Comments
						No: Parent, guardians, next of kin or emergency contact were reached after 12 hours compared to time of incident or time of discovery OR a written notice was not sent if the 12 hour timeframe was not met OR notification did not occur
6.	Facility made an immediate initial report to DMHDDAS by email.					See Expanded Investigation I.N. Yes: Report was 30 minutes or less compared to time of incident or time of discovery, given a small timeframe for first aid and immediate protections No: Report was 31 minutes or greater compared to time of incident or time of discovery OR not at all

	Standard for Immediate Protections	Yes	No	NA	Comments
1.	Immediately, staff discovering an				See Expanded Investigation II.A.
	incident provided first aid within				
	their ability related to their training,				Yes: First aid/medical services provided in 60 minutes or less
	and if applicable, requested additional				from time of incident or time of discovery
	medical assistance.				No: First aid/medical services provided in 61 minutes or
	medical assistance.				greater from time of incident or time of discovery OR
					were indicated but not provided
					NA: Standard is not relevant
2.	Target employee(s) were removed				See Expanded Investigation II.B.
	from direct care.				
					Yes: Target employees removed from direct care in 15 minutes
					or less from time of incident or time of discovery OR if
					not, a clear reason is documented
					No: Target employees removed from direct care in 16 minutes
					or more from time of incident or time of discovery OR
					removal was indicated but did not occur
					NA: Standard is not relevant
3.	Interventions were put in place to				See Expanded Investigation II.C.
	ensure the safety of all individuals,				
	staff, and other persons.				Yes: Interventions for safety are described
	•				No: Interventions for safety are not described OR do not
					include all steps a prudent person would consider to ensure
					safety
					NA: Standard is not relevant
4.	The scene was not disturbed and				See Expanded Investigation II.D.
	persons were prohibited from				
	removing or destroying actual or				Yes: Scene was not disturbed
	potential evidence.				No: Scene was disturbed
	•				NA: Standard is not relevant
5.	Potential witnesses were kept at the				See Expanded Investigation II.E.
	scene and kept separated.				
					Yes: Potential witnesses were kept at the scene and separated
					No: Potential witnesses were not kept at the scene and
					separated
			-		NA: Standard is not relevant
6.	Relevant documentary evidence was				See Expanded Investigation II.F.
	secured.				
					Yes: Relevant documentary evidence was secured
					No: Relevant documentary evidence was not secured
<u> </u>					NA: Standard is not relevant
7.	Relevant physical evidence was				See Expanded Investigation II.G.

Standard for Immediate Protections	Yes	No	NA	Comments
secured.				
				Yes: Relevant physical evidence was secured
				No: Relevant physical evidence was not secured
				NA: Standard is not relevant

S	tandard for Investigative Procedure	Yes	No	NA	Comments
1.	Investigation was initiated within 2 hours of assignment.				See Expanded Investigation I.G., I.H., III.A.1. and III.C.4. Yes: Within 2 hours of assignment, testimonial evidence was collected No: After 2 hours of assignment, testimonial evidence was collected
2.	Relevant physical evidence was collected and logged.				NA: Standard is not relevant See Expanded Investigation III.B.1. and 2. Yes: Relevant physical evidence was collected and logged No: Relevant physical evidence was not collected and/or logged NA: Standard is not relevant
3.	Photographs were taken of all visible injuries or to document that no injury was present.				See Expanded Investigation III.B.4. Yes: Photos were taken of all visible injuries or to document no injury occurred No: Photos were not taken of all visible injuries and/or to document no injury occurred NA: Standard is not relevant
4.	Relevant demonstrative evidence was collected and logged.				See Expanded Investigation III.B.5. Yes: Relevant demonstrative evidence was collected and logged No: Relevant demonstrative evidence was not collected and/or logged NA: Standard is not relevant

	Standard for Testimonial Evidence	Yes	No	NA	Comments
1.	Interview order is reporter, victims, witnesses, and aggressors/targets, OR the report CLEARLY states the reason for not doing so.				See Expanded Investigation III.C.3. and 4. Yes: Interview order is followed OR if not, a clear reason is documented No: Interview order is not followed NA: Standard is not relevant
2.	Interviews were conducted with and written statements obtained from the reporter identified, including those whose ability to communicate is impaired, using a client advocate, interpreter, familiar staff of the individual to assist with the individual, or familiar staff of the individual to provide information to assist with the questions and statement write-up OR the report CLEARLY states the reason for not doing so.				See Expanded Investigation III.C.4. Yes: Interviews are conducted as described with reporter OR if not, a clear reason is documented No: Interview with reporter did not occur NA: Standard is not relevant
3.	Interviews were conducted with and statements obtained from victims				See Expanded Investigation III.C.4. Yes: Interviews are conducted as described with victims OR if

	Standard for Testimonial Evidence	Yes	No	NA	Comments
4.	identified, including those whose ability to communicate is impaired, using a client advocate, interpreter, familiar staff of the individual to assist with the individual, or familiar staff of the individual to provide information to assist with the questions and statement write-up OR the report CLEARLY states the reason for not doing so. Interviews were conducted with and written statements obtained from				not, a clear reason is documented No: Interview with victims did not occur NA: Standard is not relevant See Expanded Investigation III.C.4.
	relevant witnesses including other individuals identified OR the report CLEARLY states the reason for not doing so.				Yes: Interviews are conducted as described with relevant witnesses OR if not, a clear reason is documented No: Interview with relevant witnesses did not occur NA: Standard is not relevant
5.	Interviews were conducted with and statements obtained from aggressors (individuals) and/or target staff identified, including those whose ability to communicate is impaired, using a client advocate, interpreter, familiar staff of the individual to assist with the individual, or familiar staff of the individual to provide information to assist with the questions and statement write-up OR the report CLEARLY states the reason for not doing so.				See Expanded Investigation III.C.4. Yes: Interviews are conducted as described with aggressors and/or target staff OR if not, a clear reason is documented No: Interview with aggressors and/or target staff did not occur NA: Standard is not relevant
6.	Interviews were conducted with and written statements obtained from staff who provided initial first aid/treatment OR the report CLEARLY states the reason for not doing so.				See Expanded Investigation III.C.4. Yes: Interviews are conducted as described with staff who provided initial first aid/treatment OR if not, a clear reason is documented No: Interview with staff who provided initial first aid/treatment did not occur NA: Standard is not relevant
7.	Interviews began within 24 hours of the incident or discovery time OR the report CLEARLY states the reason for not doing so.				See Expanded Investigation III.C.4. Yes: Interviews began within 24 hours of the time of the incident or time of discovery OR if not, a clear reason is documented No: Interviews did not begin within 24 hours of the time of the incident or time of discovery NA: Standard is not relevant
8.	Follow-up interviews were conducted if conflicting testimony was gathered during the investigation. Relevant documentary evidence,				See Expanded Investigation III.C.4. Yes: Follow-up interviews were conducted if conflicting testimony is present No: Follow-up interviews were not conducted if conflicting testimony is present NA: Standard is not relevant See Expanded Investigation III.D.1. and 2.

Standard for Testimonial Evidence		Yes	No	NA	Comments
	excluding written statements, was				
	collected and secured.				Yes: Relevant documentary evidence is present
					No: Relevant documentary evidence is not present
					NA: Standard is not relevant

St	andard for Summary of the Evidence	Yes	No	NA	Comments
1.	Initial investigatory question is framed in such a way it helped guide the investigation to determine how the incident occurred and/or how the injury occurred.				See Expanded Investigation IV.A. Yes: Question is framed to guide the investigation to determine how the incident occurred and/or how the injury occurred No: Question is not framed to guide the investigation to determine how the incident occurred and/or how the injury occurred NA: Standard is not relevant
2.	Secondary investigatory question is framed in such a way it helped guide the investigation to determine whether abuse, neglect, exploitation, mistreatment, or other harm has been found to be substantiated, unsubstantiated, or inconclusive.				Yes: Question is framed to guide the investigation to determine whether abuse, neglect, exploitation, mistreatment, or other harm has been found to be substantiated, unsubstantiated, or inconclusive No: Question is not framed to guide the investigation to determine whether abuse, neglect, exploitation, mistreatment, or other harm has been found to be substantiated, unsubstantiated, or inconclusive NA: Standard is not relevant
3.	Sufficient evidence is presented and analyzed to confirm the cause of the incident.				See Expanded Investigation IV.B. and C. Yes: Sufficient evidence is present to confirm the cause of the incident OR if not, a clear reason is documented No: Sufficient evidence is not present to confirm the cause of the incident NA: Standard is not relevant
4.	Sufficient evidence is presented and analyzed to confirm the cause of the injury.				Yes: Sufficient evidence is present to confirm the cause of the injury OR if not, a clear reason is documented No: Sufficient evidence is not present to confirm the cause of the injury NA: Standard is not relevant

	Standard for Analysis and Findings	Yes	No	NA	Comments
1.	Initial investigatory question conclusion is based on a preponderance of the evidence it is more likely than not a particular set of facts is true and includes an analysis that supports the conclusion.				See Expanded Investigation V. Yes: Conclusion is based on the preponderance of the evidence AND includes an analysis that supports the conclusion No: Conclusion is not based on the preponderance of the evidence and/or does not include an analysis that supports the conclusion NA: Standard is not relevant
2.	Secondary investigatory question conclusion is based on a preponderance of the evidence it is more likely than not a particular set of facts is true and includes an				Yes: Conclusion is based on the preponderance of the evidence AND includes an analysis that supports the conclusion No: Conclusion is not based on the preponderance of the evidence and/or does not include an analysis that supports

	Standard for Analysis and Findings	Yes	No	NA	Comments
	analysis that supports the conclusion.				the conclusion NA: Standard is not relevant
3.	Tertiary investigatory question conclusion is based on a preponderance of the evidence it is more likely than not a particular set of facts is true and includes an analysis that supports the conclusion.				See Expanded Investigation V. Yes: Conclusion is based on the preponderance of the evidence AND includes an analysis that supports the conclusion No: Conclusion is not based on the preponderance of the evidence and/or does not include an analysis that supports the conclusion NA: Standard is not relevant
4.	Quaternary investigatory question conclusion is based on a preponderance of the evidence it is more likely than not a particular set of facts is true and includes an analysis that supports the conclusion.				See Expanded Investigation V. Yes: Conclusion is based on the preponderance of the evidence AND includes an analysis that supports the conclusion No: Conclusion is not based on the preponderance of the evidence and/or does not include an analysis that supports the conclusion NA: Standard is not relevant

DMHDDAS Expanded Investigation Review - Interview Worksheet

Name of Reporter, Victims, Witnesses, Aggressors/Targets	Person Interviewed YES	Person Interviewed NO	Statement Taken YES	Statement Taken NO	Comments

Instructions: The source of the information for this worksheet is the <u>Final Expanded Investigation</u>. In compiling the list of reporters, victims, witnesses, and aggressors/targets, as applicable, the reviewer should read the entire investigative report first, including any attachments. At each point where the reviewer identifies someone who might have relevant testimonial evidence, the reviewer should write the person's name on this worksheet.

After compiling this list, compare it with those witnesses and potential witnesses the investigator actually interviewed and from whom a statement was obtained.

Responses should be marked as follows:

Person Interviewed YES

Person Interviewed, NO	Compared to the report, the witness or potential witness was not interviewed, but should have been interviewed
Statement Taken, YES	Compared to the report, the witness or potential witness gave a written statement
Statement Taken, NO	Compared to the report, the witness or potential witness did not give a written statement,
	but should have given a written statement

Compared to the report the witness or potential witness was interviewed

If the reviewer writes down a name of a witness or potential witness and makes a determination after reviewing the report that neither an interview nor statement was needed, mark one solid line through the name and comment appropriately in the Comments section.